IMT Nuremberg Archives

H – 971

International Court of Justice

Com. B
Take 4 - P 12
Noll
21 June 1946
Hoeppner

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY FOR THE DEFENSE OF ORGANIZATIONS, TAKEN BEFORE A COMMISSION APPOINTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 4 OF THE ORDER OF THE TRIBUNAL DATED 13 MARCH 1946.

H0971-0002

COMMISSIONER:

Mr. George R. Taylor

THE SD

(The Commission reconvened at 1635 hours)

ROLF-HEINZ HOEPPNER, a witness, took the stand and testified as follows:

BY MR. TAYLOR:

Q. Will you state your full name?

A. Rolf-Heinz Hoeppner.

Q. Will you raise your right hand, and repeat after me?

I swear by God, the Almighty and Omniscient, that I will speak the whole truth and will withhold and add nothing.

(The witness repeats the oath.)

BY DR. GAWLIK:

I wish to prove by interrogating the witness Hoeppner, the following: (1) The SD as an intelligence office and the SD in its formations and the Reich Security Service are entirely separate organizations. The organizations of the domestic intelligence service, Amt Three, RSHA, the foreign intelligence service, Amt Six, and the scientific research, Amt Seven, RSHA, are entirely separate organizations. Amt Three, RSHA, the domestic intelligence service, was not a part of the SD, but an independent organization. The domestic intelligence service, Amt Three, RSHA, was not a section of the Party, but an entirely independent organization. The domestic intelligence service, Amt Three, RSHA, was not a part of a unified police system, and it did not belong to the duties of the domestic intelligence service to support the tasks set for the Gestapo. I further wish to prove that the SD was not responsible for the installation and operation of concentration camps and for the evacuation of individuals who were racially and politically undesirable into these concentration camps and

H0971 - 0003

annihilation camps. ~~(See Trial Brief, Page 43.)~~ That it did not belong to the aims and activities of Group 3-A to commit crimes against the peace and against humanity. That it did not belong to the duties and activities of the domestic intelligence service, Amt Three, RSHA, to execute the intelligence which they had gathered. (See German Brief, Page 49.)

Q. I first wish to put some questions which will prove that the witness is qualified. Since when were you a member of the SD?

A. Since the Spring of 1934.

Q. What office did you occupy?

A. I was in charge of the press in the Oberabschnitt. Later on I became chief of organizations and Oberabschnitt, at the end of 1935. Then I was given a leave to take my state examination for nine months in 1938. No, that was not in 1938, but in 1937. On the first of November, 1937, I came as stabsfuehrer to Dresden to the SD Leitabschnitt. I was in Dresden until April 1940. Since May 1, 1941 I was abschnittfuehrer in Posen. I was in Posen until the beginning of July 1944. I then went, as chief of Section 3-A, into the RSHA. I remained there until its dissolution.

Q. What examination did you take?

A. A law examination.

Q. I will now come to Point One of the things to be proven. What is the significance of SD?

A. SD means "sicherheitsdienst."

Q. What significance has the word "sicherheitsdienst"?

A. It has two meanings which are essentially different. In the first place, it refers to the SS formation "sicherheitsdienst"; and, furthermore, the word sicherheitsdiense means "an information-gathering agency."

H0971-0004

Q. Was the foreign intelligence also called /SD/?

A. Yes.

Q. Was Amt Seven also called SD?

A. Yes.

Q. Was there a basic difference between the SD as an SS formation, SD as domestic intelligence, and SD as Amt Seven, scientific research?

A. The SS formation of the SD was something entirely fx different.

Q. To whom was the SS formation SD subordinated?

A. The SS formation SD was subordinated to the chief of the security police. At the end xf it was Kaltenbrunner.

Q. Who were the members of this special formation of the SS?

A. The following groups belonged to this special formation: Those who belonged to the Allgemeine SS, to the general SS before they entered the service of the SD, or the SIPO. Then those who, having done service with SD or SIPO as applicants to join the SS SS, wished to join the SD.

Q. Were there also other persons who were not working with the SIPO or with the x intelligence service?

A. There were, within the SIPO, formations which received directives from the SIPO but did not belong within this society immediately. I am referring here to the customs and border inspection. These border patrols also were integrated as SD.

Q. Did this collection of persons have a collective general purpose? I refer here to the characterization given by Justice Jackson.

LT. HARRIS: I object to the last xxx portion of the question and move that it be stricken from the record. This witness does not know what the characterization was. There is nothing to show that he does.

H0971-0005

DR. GAWLIK: I am personally agreeable to having it strichen from the record.

A. No. This special task formation, SD, within the SS, did not have a general purpose. It was merely a matter of revision. This revision took place first in the Reichssicherheitshauptamt and, later, after its installation in 1939, in Section One of the RSHA.

Q. Were these people doing something collectively?

A. No. These persons had entirely different activities to fulfill--whether they were with the SD, or the SIPO, the Gestapo, or the criminal police.

Q. Did these people who were all collected under that one name have a feeling of belonging together?

A. No. May I give an example of this. Members of the criminal police were accepted in the SD if the Reichsfuehrer of the SS had a medical certificate as to their health. They were not particularly enthusiastic about that, because from their civil service position point of view additional difficulties arose. They did not have any feeling of belonging together with, for instance, those SD people who emanated from the genaral SS.

Q. Was there a Reichssicherheitsdienst next to the SD intelligence service and the SD formation within the SS?

A. Yes, but that was entirely different.

Q. What was the task of the Reichssicherheitsdienst?

A. One of the tasks was the protection of the fuehrer and the protection of other individuals designated by the fuehrer himself. The chief of this, of course, was Rattenhuber.

Q. Was there any connection between the Reichssicherheitsdienst and the SD as in domestic intelligence service or with the SD as within the SS?

H0971-0006

A. It was an entirely independent formation which was immediately subordinate to the Reichsfuehrer SS.

Q. So the Reichssicherheitsdienst was a completely independent organization?

A. Yes.

Q. I now come to Point Two. Were the tasks ~~and~~ of Amts ~~Three~~ Three, Six, and Seven different ones?

A. Yes.

Q. ~~Would~~ Could you describe them?

A. Amt Three was charged with the task of collecting information within the borders of the Reich. Amt Six collected information outside the borders of the Reich. Amt Seven was occupied with archives, records, evaluation of press, and other specified scientific matters.

Q. ~~Was~~ Were the activity/ies of these three amts different ones?

A. Yes.

~~Q~~ A. It was the duty of Amt Three to collect information from the broad masses of the population regarding certain situations which had to be changed. Amt Seven occupied itself with libraries and records. Amt Six collected information from ~~a~~ without the borders of the Reich which might be used in formulating the foreign policies of the Reich.

(The Commission adjourned at 1715 hours.)

H0971 - 0007

The foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the testimony of ROLF-HEINZ HOEPPNER, taken on 21 June 1946.

Reporter (pp

CERTIFIED TO :

Commissioner

Com. B
Take 4 - P 12
Noll
21 June 1946
Hoeppner

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY FOR THE DEFENSE OF ORGANIZATIONS, TAKEN BEFORE A COMMISSION APPOINTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 4 OF THE ORDER OF THE TRIBUNAL DATED 13 MARCH 1946.

Com Copy

H0971-0008

COMMISSIONER:

Mr. George R. Taylor

THE SD

(The Commission reconvened at 1635 hours)

ROLF-HEINZ HOEPPNER, a witness, took the stand and testified as follows:

BY MR. TAYLOR:

Q. Will you state your full name?

A. Rolf-Heinz Hoeppner.

Q. Will you raise your right hand, and repeat after me?

I swear by God, the Almighty and ~~Omniscient~~ Omniscient, that I will speak the whole truth and will withhold and hide nothing.

(The witness repeats the oath.)

BY DR. GAWLIK:

I wish to prove by interrogating the witness ~~Hoe~~ Hoeppner, the following: (1) The SD as an intelligence office and the SD in its formations and the Reich Security Service are ~~i~~ entirely separate organizations. The organizations of the ~~interior~~ domestic/intelligence service, Amt Three, RSHA, the foreign intelligence service, Amt Six, and the Scientific research, Amt Seven, RSHA, are entirely separate organizations. Amt Three, RSHA, the domestic intelligence service, was not a part of the SD, but an independent organization. The domestic intelligence service, Amt Three, RSHA, was not a section of the ~~par~~ Party, but an ~~i~~ entirely independent organization. The domestic intelligence service, Amt Three, RSHA, was not a part of a unified police system, and it ~~does~~ did/not belong to the duties of the domestic intelligence service to support the tasks set for the Gestapo. I further wish to prove that the SD was not responsible for the installation and operation of ~~camps~~ concentration camps and for the evacuation of individuals who were racially and politically undesirable into these concentration camps and

H0971 - 0009

annihilation camps. (See Trial Brief, Page 43.) That it did not belong to the aims and activities of Group 3-A to commit crimes against the peace and against humanity. That it did not belong to the duties and activities of the domestic intelligence service, Amt Three, RSHA, to execute the intelligence which they had gathered. (See German Brief, Page 49.)

Q. I first wish to put some questions which will prove that the witness is qualified. Since when were you a member of the SD?

A. Since the Spring of 1934.

Q. What office did you occupy?

A. I was in charge of the press in the Oberabschnitt. Later on I became chief of organizations and Oberabschnitt, at the end of 1935. Then I was given a leave to take my state examination for nine months in 1938. No, that was not in 1938, but in 1937. On the first of November, 1937, I came as stabsfuehrer to Dresden to the SD Leitabschnitt. I was in Dresden until April 1940. Since May 1, 1941 I was abschnittfuehrer in Posen. I was in Posen until the beginning of July 1944. I then went, as chief of Section 3-A, into the RSHA. I remained there until its dissolution.

Q. What examination did you take?

A. A law examination.

Q. I will now come to Point One of the things to be proven. What is the significance of SD?

A. SD means "sicherheitsdienst."

Q. What significance has the word "sicherheitsdienst"?

A. It has two meanings which are essentially different. In the first place, it refers to the SS formation "sicherheitsdienst"; and, furthermore, the word sicherheitsdienst means "an information-gathering agency."

H0971 - 0010

Q. Was the foreign intelligence also called /SD/?

A. Yes.

Q. Was Amt Seven also called SD?

A. Yes.

Q. Was there a basic difference between the SD as an SS formation, SD as domestic intelligence, and SD as Amt Seven, scientific research?

A. The SS formation of the SD was something entirely fx different.

Q. To whom was the SS formation SD subordinated?

A. The SS formation SD was subordinated to the chief of the security police. At the end xf it was Kaltenbrunner.

Q. Who were the members of this special formation of the SS?

A. The following groups belonged to this special formation: Those who belonged to the Allgemeine SS, to the general SS before they entered the service of the SD or the SIPO. Then those who, having done service with SD or SIPO as applicants to join the SS, wished to join the SD.

Q. Were there also other persons who were not working with the SIPO or with the x intelligence service?

A. There were, within the SIPO, formations which received directives from the SIPO but did not belong within this society immediately. I am referring here to the customs and border inspection. These border patrols also were integrated as SD.

Q. Did this collection of persons have a collective general purpose? I refer here to the characterization given by Justice Jackson.

LT. HARRIS: I object to the last xxx portion of the question and move that it be stricken from the record. This witness does not know what the characterization was. There is nothing to show that he does.

H0971-0011

DR. GAWLIK: I am personally agreeable to having it stricken from the record.

A. No. This special task formation, SD, within the SS, did not have a general purpose. It was merely a matter of revision. This revision took place first in the Reichssicherheitshauptamt and, later, after its installation in 1939, in Section One of the RSHA.

Q. Were these people doing something collectively?

A. No. These persons had entirely different activities to fulfill--whether they were with the SD, or the SIPO, the Gestapo, or the criminal police.

Q. Did these people who were all collected under that one name have a feeling of belonging together?

A. No. May I give an example of this. Members of the criminal police were accepted in the SD if the Reichsfuehrer of the SS had a medical certificate as to their health. They were not particularly enthusiastic about that, because from their civil service position point of view additional difficulties arose. They did not have any feeling of belonging together with, for instance, those SD people who emanated from the general SS.

Q. Was there a Reichssicherheitsdienst next to the SD intelligence service and the SD formation within the SS?

A. Yes, but that was entirely different.

Q. What was the task of the Reichssicherheitsdienst?

A. One of the tasks was the protection of the fuehrer and the protection of other individuals designated by the fuehrer himself. The chief of this, of course, was Rattenhuber.

Q. Was there any connection between the Reichssicherheitsdienst and the SD as in domestic intelligence service or with the SD as within the SS?

H0971 - 0012

A. It was an entirely independent formation which was immediately subordinate to the Reichsfuehrer SS.

Q. So the Reichssicherheitsdienst was a completely independent organization?

A. Yes.

Q. I now come to Point Two. Were the tasks ~~xxx~~ of Amts~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ Three, Six, and Seven different ones?

A. Yes.

Q. ~~Xxxx~~ Could you describe them?

A. Amt Three was charged with the task of collecting information within the borders of the Reich. Amt Six collected information outside the borders of the Reich. Amt Seven was occupied with archives, records, evaluation of press, and other specified scientific matters.

Q. ~~Xxx~~/Were the activit~~y~~ies of these three amts different ones?

A. Yes.

~~Qx~~ It was the duty of Amt Three to collect information from the broad masses of the population regarding certain situations which had to be changed. Amt Seven occupied itself with libraries and records. Amt Six collected information from ~~x~~ without the borders of the Reich which might be used in formulating the foreign policies of the Reich.

(The Commission adjourned at 1715 hours.)

H0971 - 0013

The foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the testimony of ROLF-HEINZ HOEPPNER, taken on 21 June 1946.

D. J. Noll
Reporter pp

CERTIFIED TO :

Commissioner

HO971-0014

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY FOR THE DEFENSE OF ORGANIZATIONS, TAKEN BEFORE A COMMISSION APPOINTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 4 OF THE ORDER OF THE TRIBUNAL DATED 13 MARCH 1946.

21 June 1946

COMMISSIONER:

Mr. George R. Taylor

THE SD.

(The Commission reconvened at 1635 hours.)

ROLF-HEINZ HOEPPNER, a witness, took the stand and testified as follows:

BY MR. TAYLOR:

Q Will you state your fullname?

A Rolf-Heinz Hoeppner.

Q Will you raise your right hand, and repeat after me?

I swear by God, the Almighty and Omniscient, that I will speak the pure truth and willwithhold and add nothing.

(The witness repeats the oath.)

BY DR. GAWLIK:

I wish to prove by interrogating the witness Hoeppner, the following: (1) The SD as an intelligence office and the SD in its formations and the Reich Security Service are entirely separate organizations. The organizations of the domestic intelligence service, Amt Three, RSHA, the foreign intelligence service, Amr Six, and the Scientific research, Amt Seven, RSHA, are entirely separate organizations. Amt Three, RSHA, the domestic intelligence service, was not a part of the SD, but an independent organization. The domestic intelligence service, Amt Three, RSHA, was not a section of the Party, but an entirely independent organization. The domestic intelligence service, Amt Three, RSHA, was not a part of a unified police system, and it did not belong to the duties of the domestic intelligence service to support the tasks set for the Gestapo. I further wish to prove that the SD was not responsible for the installation and operation of concentration camps and for the evacuation of individuals who were racially and politically undesirable into these concentration camps and annihilation camps. (See Trial Brief, Page 43.) That it did not belong to the aims and activities of Group 3-A to commit crimes against the peace and against

H0971-0015

humanity. That it did not belong to the duties and activities of the domestic intelligence service, Amt Three, RSHA, to execute the intelligence which they had gathered. (See German Brief, Page 49).

Q I first wish to put some questions which will prove that the witness is qualified. Since when were you a member of the SD?

A Since the spring of 1934.

Q What office did you occupy?

A I was in charge of the press in the Oberabschnitt. Later on I became chief of organizations and Oberabschnitt, at the end of 1935. Then I was given a leave to take my state examination for nine months in 1938. No, that was not in 1938, but in 1937. On the first of November, 1937, I came as stabsfuehrer to Dresden to the SD Leitabschnitt, I was in Dresden until April 1940. Since May 1, 1941 I was abschnittfuehrer in Posen. I was in Posen until the beginning of July 1944. I then went, as chief of Section 3-A, into the RSHA. I remained there until its dissolution.

Q What examination did you take?

A A law examination.

Q I willnow come to Point One of the things to be proven. What is the significance of SD?

A SD means "sicherheitsdienst."

Q What significance has the word "sicherheitsdienst"?

A It has two meanings which are essentially different. In the first place, it refers to the SS formation "sicherheitsdienst"; and, furthermore, the word sicherheitsdiense means "an information-gathering agency."

Q Was the foreign intelligence also called SD?

A Yes.

Q Was Amt Seven also called SD?

A Yes.

Q Was there a basic difference between the SD as an SS formation, SD as domestic intelligence, and SD as Amt Seven, scientific research?

A The SS formation of the SD was something entirely different.

Q To whom was the SS formation SD subordinated?

A The SS formation SD was subordinated to the chief of the security police. At the end it was Kaltenbrunner.

H0971-0016

Q Who were the members of this special formation of the SS?

A The following groups belonged to this special formation: Those who belonged to the Allgemeine SS, to the general SS before they entered the service of the SD, or the SIPO. Then those who, having done service with SD or SIPO as applicants to join the SS, wished to join the SD.

Q Were there also other persons who were not working with the SIPO or with the intelligence service?

A There were, within the SIPO, formations which received directives from the SIPO but did not belong within this society immediately. I am referring here to the customs and border inspection. These border patrols also were integrated as SD.

Q Did this collection of persons have a collective general purpose? I refer here to the characterization given by JusticeJackson.

LT. HARRIS: I object to the last portion of the question and move that it be stricken from the record. This witness does not know what the characterization was. There is nothing to show that he does.

DR. GAWLIK: I am personally agreeable to having it stricken from the record.

A No. This special task formation, SD, within the SS, did not have a general purpose. It was merely a matter of revision. This revision took place first in the Reichssicherheitshauptamt and, later, after its installation in 1939, in Section One of the RSHA.

Q Were these people doing something collectively?

A No. These persons had entirely different activities to fulfil - whether they were with the SD, or the SIPO, the Gestapo, or the criminal police.

Q Did these people who were all collected under that one name have a feeling of belonging together?

A No. May I give an example of this. Members of the criminal police were accepted in the SD if the Reichsfuehrer of the SS had a medical certificate as to their health. They were not particularly enthusiastic about that, because from their civil service position point of view

H0971-0017

additional difficulties arose. They did not have any feeling of belonging together with, for instance, those SD people who emanated from the general SS.

Q Was there a Reichssicherheitsdienst next to the SD intelligence service and the SD formation within the SS?

A Yes, but that was entirely different.

Q What was the task of the Reichssicherheitsdienst?

A One of the tasks was the protection of the fuehrer and the protection of other individuals designated by the fuehrer himself. The chief of this, of course, was Rattenhuber.

Q Was there any connection between the Reichssicherheitsdienst and the SD as domestic intelligence service or with the SD as within the SS?

A It was an entirely independent formation which was immediately subordinate to the Reichsfuehrer SS.

Q So the Reichssicherheitsdienst was a completely independent organization?

A Yes.

Q I now come to Point Two. Were the tasks of Amts Three, Six, and Seven different ones?

A Yes.

Q Could you describe them?

A Amt Three was charged with the task of collecting information within the borders of the Reich. Amt Six collected information outside the borders of the Reich. Amt Seven was occupied with archives, records, evaluation of press, and other specified scientific matters.

Q Were the activities of these three amts different ones?

A Yes. It was the duty of Amt Three to collect information from the broad masses of the population regarding certain situations which had to be changed. Amt Seven occupied itself with libraries and records. Amt Six collected information from without the borders of the Reich which might be used in formulating the foreign policies of the Reich.

(The Commission adjourned at 1715 hours.)

H0971-0018

The foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the testimony of ROLF-HEINZ HOEPPNER, taken on 21 June 1946.

D.J. NOLL
Reporter

CERTIFIED TO:

GEO. R. TAYLOR
Commissioner

H0971 - 0019

OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY FOR THE DEFENSE OF ORGANIZATIONS, TAKEN BEFORE A COMMISSION APPOINTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 4 OF THE ORDER OF THE TRIBUNAL DATED 13 MARCH 1946.

21 June 1946

COMMISSIONER:

Mr. George R. Taylor

THE SD.

(The Commission reconvened at 1635 hours.)

ROLF-HEINZ HOEPPNER, a witness, took the stand and testified as follows:

BY MR. TAYLOR:

Q Will you state your fullname?

A Rolf-Heinz Hoeppner.

Q Will you raise your right hand, and repeat after me?

I swear by God, the Almighty and Omniscient, that I will speak the pure truth and willwithhold and add nothing.

(The witness repeats the oath.)

BY DR. GAWLIK:

I wish to prove by interrogating the witness Hoeppner, the following: (1) The SD as an intelligence office and the SD in its formations and the Reich Security Service are entirely separate organizations. The organizations of the domestic intelligence service, Amt Three, RSHA, the foreign intelligence service, Amr Six, and the Scientific research, Amt Seven, RSHA, are entirely separate organizations. Amt Three, RSHA, the domestic intelligence service, was not a part of the SD, but an independent organization. The domestic intelligence service, Amt Three, RSHA, was not a section of the Party, but an entirely independent organization. The domestic intelligence service, Amt Three, RSHA, was not a part of a unified police system, and it did not belong to the duties of the domestic intelligence service to support the tasks set for the Gestapo. I further wish to prove that the SD was not responsible for the installation and operation of concentration camps and for the evacuation of individuals who were racially and politically undesirable into these concentration camps and annihilation camps. (See Trial Brief, Page 43.) That it did not belong to the aims and activities of Group 3-A to commit crimes against the peace and against

H0971-0020

humanity. That it did not belong to the duties and activities of the domestic intelligence service, Amt Three, RSHA, to execute the intelligence which they had gathered. (See German Brief, Page 49).

Q I first wish to put some questions which will prove that the witness is qualified. Since when were you a member of the SD?

A Since the spring of 1934.

Q What office did you occupy?

A I was in charge of the press in the Oberabschnitt. Later on I became chief of organizations and Oberabschnitt, at the end of 1935. Then I was given a leave to take my state examination for nine months in 1938. No, that was not in 1938, but in 1937. On the first of November, 1937, I came as stabsfuehrer to Dresden to the SD Leitabschnitt, I was in Dresden until April 1940. Since May 1, 1941 I was abschnittfuehrer in Posen. I was in Posen until the beginning of July 1944. I then went, as chief of Section 3-A, into the RSHA. I remained there until its dissolution.

Q What examination did you take?

A A law examination.

Q I willnow come to Point One of the things to be proven. What is the significance of SD?

A SD means "sicherheitsdienst."

Q What significance has the word "sicherheitsdienst"?

A It has two meanings which are essentially different. In the first place, it refers to the SS formation "sicherheitsdienst"; and, furthermore, the word sicherheitsdiense means "an information-gathering agency."

Q Was the foreign intelligence also called SD?

A Yes.

Q Was Amt Seven also called SD?

A Yes.

Q Was there a basic difference between the SD as an SS formation, SD as domestic intelligence, and SD as Amt Seven, scientific research?

A The SS formation of the SD was something entirely different.

Q To whom was the SS formation SD subordinated?

A The SS formation SD was subordinated to the chief of the security police. At the end it was Kaltenbrunner.

H0971-0021

Q Who were the members of this special formation of the SS?

A The following groups belonged to this special formation: Those who belonged to the Allgemeine SS, to the general SS before they entered the service of the SD, or the SIPO. Then those who, having done service with SD or SIPO as applicants to join the SS, wished to join the SD.

Q Were there also other persons who were not working with the SIPO or with the intelligence service?

A There were, within the SIPO, formations which received directives from the SIPO but did not belong within this society immediately. I am referring here to the customs and border inspection. These border patrols also were integrated as SD.

Q Did this collection of persons have a collective general purpose? I refer here to the characterization given by JusticeJackson.

LT. HARRIS: I object to the last portion of the question and move that it be stricken from the record. This witness does not know what the characterization was. There is nothing to show that he does.

DR. GAWLIK: I am personally agreeable to having it stricken from the record.

A No. This special task formation, SD, within the SS, did not have a general purpose. It was merely a matter of revision. This revision took place first in the Reichssicherheitshauptamt and, later, after its installation in 1939, in Section One of the RSHA.

Q Were these people doing something collectively?

A No. Those persons had entirely different activities to fulfil - whether they were with the SD, or the SIPO, the Gestapo, or the criminal police.

Q Did these people who were all collected under that one name have a feeling of belonging together?

A No. May I give an example of this. Members of the criminal police were accepted in the SD if the Reichsfuehrer of the SS had a medical certificate as to their health. They were not particularly enthusiastic about that, because from their civil service position point of view

H0971-0022

additional difficulties arose. They did not have any feeling of belonging together with, for instance, those SD people who emanated from the general SS.

Q Was there a Reichssicherheitsdienst next to the SD intelligence service and the SD formation within the SS?

A Yes, but that was entirely different.

Q What was the task of the Reichssicherheitsdienst?

A One of the tasks was the protection of the fuehrer and the protection of other individuals designated by the fuehrer himself. The chief of this, of course, was Rattenhuber.

Q Was there any connection between the Reichssicherheitsdienst and the SD as domestic intelligence service or with the SD as within the SS?

A It was an entirely independent formation which was immediately subordinate to the Reichsfuehrer SS.

Q So the Reichssicherheitsdienst was a completely independent organization?

A Yes.

Q I now come to Point Two. Were the tasks of Amts Three, Six, and Seven different ones?

A Yes.

Q Could you describe them?

A Amt Three was charged with the task of collecting information within the borders of the Reich. Amt Six collected information outside the borders of the Reich. Amt Seven was occupied with archives, records, evaluation of press, and other specified scientific matters.

Q Were the activities of these three amts different ones?

A Yes. It was the duty of Amt Three to collect information from the broad masses of the population regarding certain situations which had to be changed. Amt Seven occupied itself with libraries and records. Amt Six collected information from without the borders of the Reich which might be used in formulating the foreign policies of the Reich.

(The Commission adjourned at 1715 hours.)

H0971-0023

The foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the testimony of ROLF-HEINZ HOEPPNER, taken on 21 June 1946.

D.J. NOLL
Reporter

CERTIFIED TO:

GEO. R. TAYLOR
Commissioner